

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-68 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 10-14, 16-18, 19, 22-29, 33-37, 39, 43-44, 46-47, 50, 56-58, 65, 66, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,313,635 (the '635 patent). The Examiner states that the '635 patent discloses a compiling system having method steps of transmitting compilation information from a first subsystem to a second subsystem (col. 2, lines 42-62); compiling computer program code on the second subsystem based on the compilation information received from the first subsystem (col. 2, lines 62-68; col. 5, lines 17-30); and receiving the compiled code from the second subsystem into the first subsystem (col. 3, lines 18-23).

The Examiner specifically acknowledges that the '635 patent does not explicitly specify that the step of compiling in the second subsystem generates machine-executable code. And, as such, the first subsystem cannot possibly transmit compilation instructions regarding the particular machine-executable code required to the second subsystem. In direct contrast, as amended, claim 1 of the present application requires "transmitting compilation information from a first subsystem, including at least compilation instructions related to the particular machine-executed code required by the first subsystem, to a second subsystem".

Instead, the '635 patent teaches transmitting a compilation request. In fact, the '635 patent specifically teaches away from the above-mentioned limitation. Col. 2, lines 45-50 state that the library-installed machine table 305 is contained within the second subsystem 301 and not the first subsystem 302; also see Figure 3. It is noted, however, that this library-installed machine table 305 is not the same as or equivalent to the compilation instructions sent by the

first subsystem of the present invention. The library-installed machine table 305 is a table of machines and their contents rather than specific compilation instructions. However, this table is located within the second subsystem 301, not the first subsystem 302; so therefore, we need not address the contents of the library installed machine table 305.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1, as now amended, is allowable over the '635 patent. In addition, because claims 2-18 depend from allowable claim 1, claims 2-18 are allowable over the '635 patent as well.

Likewise, independent claims 19, 27, 34, 48, and 56 contain a similar limitation to that discussed with reference to claim 1 above. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 19, 27, 34, 48, and 56, as now amended, are allowable over the '635 patent as well. Furthermore, because claims 20-26 depend from claim 19, claims 28-33 depend from claim 27, claims 35-47 depend from claim 34, claims 49-55 depend from claim 48, and claims 57-68 depend from claim 56, these claims are allowable over the '635 patent as well.


Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections, and a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612/332-5300

Date: 9/2/2003



Erik G. Swenson
Reg. No. 45,147
EGS:PSTklg

